arXiv:1407.7509v1 [math.RA] 28 Jul 2014

Matrix nil-clean factorizations over abelian rings

Huanyin Chen*

Abstract

A ring R is nil-clean if every element in R is the sum of an idempotent and a nilpotent. A ring R is abelian if every idempotent is central. We prove that if R is abelian then $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean if and only if $R/J(R)$ is Boolean and $M_n(J(R))$ is nil. This extend the main results of Breaz et al. [2] and that of Koşan et al. [4].

Keywords: idempotent matrix; nilpotent matrix; nil-clean ring.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 15A23, 15B33, 16S50.

1 Introduction

Let R be a ring with an identity. An element $a \in R$ is called nil-clean if there exists an idempotent $e \in R$ such that $a - e \in R$ is a nilpotent. A ring R is nil-clean provided that every element in R is nil-clean. In [1, Question 3], Diesl asked: Let R be a nil clean ring, and let n be a positive integer. Is $M_n(R)$ nil clean? In [2, Theorem 3], Breaz et al. proved that their main theorem: for a field K, $M_n(K)$ is nil-clean if and only if $K \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. They also asked if this result could be extended to division rings. As a main result in [4], Koşan et al. gave a positive answer to this problem. They showed that the preceding equivalence holds for any division ring.

A ring R is abelian if every idempotent in R is central. Clearly, every division ring is abelian. We extend, in this article, the main results of Breaz et al. [2, Theorem 3] and that of Koşan et al. [4, Theorem 3]. We shall prove that for an abelian ring R, $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean if and only if $R/J(R)$ is Boolean and $M_n(J(R))$ is nil. As a corollary, we also prove that the converse of a result of Koşan et al.'s is true.

Throughout, all rings are associative with an identity. $M_n(R)$ will denote the ring of all $n \times n$ full matrices over R with an identity I_n. $GL_n(R)$ stands for the n-dimensional general liner group of R.

2 The main result

We begin with several lemmas which will be needed in our proof of the main result.

Lemma 2.1 *[1, Proposition 3.15] Let I be a nil ideal of a ring R. Then R is nil-clean if and only if R/I is nil-clean.*

Lemma 2.2 *[4, Theorem 3] Let R be a division ring. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.

*Department of Mathematics, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, 310036, People's Republic of China, e-mail: huanyinchen@aliyun.com

(2) $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(3) $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Recall that a ring R is an exchange ring if for every $a \in R$ there exists an idempotent $e \in aR$ such that $1 - e \in (1 - a)R$. Clearly, every nil-clean ring is an exchange ring.

Lemma 2.3 *Let R be an abelian exchange ring, and let $x \in R$. Then $RxR = R$ if and only if $x \in U(R)$.*

Proof If $x \in U(R)$, then $RxR = R$. Conversely, assume that $RxR = R$. As in the proof of [3, Proposition 17.1.9], there exists an idempotent $e \in R$ such that $e \in xR$ such that $ReR = R$. This implies that $e = 1$. Write $xy = 1$. Then $yx = y(xy)x = (yx)^2$. Hence, $yx = y(yx)x$. Therefore $1 = x(yx)y = xy(yx)xy = yx$, and so $x \in U(R)$. This completes the proof. □

Set

$$J^*(R) = \bigcap \{P \mid P \text{ is a maximal ideal of } R\}.$$

We will see that $J(R) \subseteq J^*(R)$. In general, they are not the same. For instance, $J(R) = 0$ and $J^*(R) = \{x \in R \mid dim_F(xV) < \infty\}$, where $R = End_F(V)$ and V is an infinite-dimensional vector space over a field F.

Lemma 2.4 *Let R be an abelian exchange ring. Then $J^*(R) = J(R)$.*

Proof Let M be a maximal ideal of R. If $J(R) \nsubseteq M$, then $J(R) + M = R$. Write $x + y = 1$ with $x \in J(R), y \in M$. Then $y = 1 - x \in U(R)$, an absurd. Hence, $J(R) \subseteq M$. This implies that $J(R) \subseteq J^*(R)$. Let $x \in J^*(R)$, and let $r \in R$. If $R(1 - xr)R \neq R$, then we can find a maximal ideal M of R such that $R(1 - xr)R \subseteq M$, and so $1 - xr \in M$. It follows that $1 = xr + (1 - xr) \in M$, which is imposable. Therefore $R(1 - xr)R = R$. In light of Lemma 2.3, $1 - xr \in U(R)$, and then $x \in J(R)$. This completes the proof. □

A ring R is local if R has only maximal right ideal. As is well know, a ring R is local if and only if for every $a \in R$, either a or $1 - a$ is invertible if and only $R/J(R)$ is a division ring.

Lemma 2.5 *Let R be a ring with no non-trivial idempotents, and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean.

(2) $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $M_n(J(R))$ is nil.

Proof (1) ⇒ (2) In view of [1, Proposition 3.16], $J(M_n(R))$ is nil, and then so is $M_n(J(R))$.

Let $a \in R$. By hypothesis, $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean. If $n = 1$, then R is nil-clean. Then $a \in N(R)$ or $a - 1 \in N(R)$. This shows that $a \in U(R)$ or $1 - a \in U(R)$, and so R is local. That is, $R/J(R)$ is a division ring. As $R/J(R)$ is nil-clean, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. We now assume that $n \geq 2$. Then there exists an idempotent $E \in M_n(R)$ and a nilpotent $W \in GL_n(R)$ such that

$I_n + \begin{pmatrix} a & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} = E + W$. Set $U = -I_n + W$. Then $U \in GL_n(R)$. Hence,

$$U^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} a & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} = U^{-1}E + I_n = \big(U^{-1}EU\big)U^{-1} + I_n.$$

Set $F = U^{-1}EU$. Then $F = F^2 \in M_n(R)$, and that

$$(I_n - F)U^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} a & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} = I_n - F.$$

Write $I_n - F = \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 & & \\ * & 0 & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ * & 0 & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. As R possesses no non-trivial idempotents, $e = 0$ or 1. If $e = 0$, then $I_n - F = 0$, and so $E = I_n$. This shows that $\begin{pmatrix} a & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} = W$ is nilpotent; hence that $a \in R$ is nilpotent. Thus, $1 - a \in U(R)$.

If $e = 1$, then $F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & & \\ * & 1 & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ * & 0 & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Write $U^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix}$, where $\alpha \in R, \beta \in M_{1\times(n-1)}(R)$, $\gamma \in M_{(n-1)\times 1}(R)$ and $\delta \in M_{(n-1)\times(n-1)}(R)$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x & I_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} + I_n,$$

where $x \in M_{(n-1)\times 1}(R)$. Thus, we get

$$\alpha a = 1, \gamma a = x\alpha + \gamma, 0 = x\beta + \delta + I_{n-1}.$$

One easily checks that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \beta \\ 0 & I_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ x & I_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} U^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \gamma a & I_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha + \beta\gamma a & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This implies that $u := \alpha + \beta\gamma a \in U(R)$. Hence, $\alpha = u - \beta\gamma a$. It follows from $\alpha a = 1$ that $(u - \beta\gamma a)a = 1$. As R is connected, we see that $a(u - \beta\gamma a) = 1$, and so $a \in U(R)$. This shows that $a \in U(R)$ or

$1-a \in U(R)$. Therefore R is local, and then $R/J(R)$ is a division ring. Since $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean, we see that so is $M_n(R/J(R))$. In light of Lemma 2.2, $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, as desired.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) In view of Lemma 2.1, $M_n(R/J(R))$ is nil-clean. Since $M_n(R)/J(M_n(R)) \cong M_n(R/J(R))$ and $J\big(M_n(R)\big) = M_n(J(R))$ is nil, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean, as asserted. □

Example 2.6 *Let K be a field, and let $R = K[x,y]/(x,y)^2$. Then $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean if and only if $K \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Clearly, $J(R) = (x,y)/(x,y)^2$, and so $R/J(R) \cong K$. Thus, R is a local ring with a nilpotent Jacobson radical. Hence, R has no non-trivial idempotents. Thus, we are done by Lemma 2.5.*

We come now to our main result.

Theorem 2.7 *Let R be abelian, and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean.

(2) $R/J(R)$ is Boolean and $M_n(J(R))$ is nil.

Proof (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) Clearly, $M_n(J(R))$ is nil. Let M be a maximal ideal of R, and let $\varphi_M : R \to R/M$. Since $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean, then so is $M_n(R/M)$. Hence, R/M is an exchange ring with all idempotents central. In view of [3, Lemma 17.2.5], R/M is local, and so R/M is connected. In view of Lemma 2.5, $R/M/J(R/M) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Write $J(R/M) = K/M$. Then K is a maximal ideal of R, and that $M \subseteq K$. This implies that $M = K$; hence, $R/M \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Construct a map $\varphi_M : R/J^*(R) \to R/M, r + J^*(R) \mapsto r + M$. Then $\bigcap\limits_M Ker\varphi_M = \bigcap\limits_M \{r + J^*(R) \mid r \in M\} = 0$. Therefore $R/J^*(R)$ is isomorphic to a subdirect product of some $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Hence, $R/J^*(R)$ is Boolean. In light of Lemma 2.4, $R/J(R)$ is Boolean, as desired.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) Since $R/J(R)$ is Boolean, it follows by [2, Corollary 6] that $M_n(R/J(R))$ is nil-clean. That is, $M_n(R)/J(M_n(R))$ is nil-clean. But $J(M_n(R)) = M_n(J(R))$ is nil. Therefore we complete the proof, by Lemma 2.1. □

We note that the "(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)" in Theorem 2.7 always holds, but "abelian" condition is necessary in "(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)". Let $R = M_n(\mathbb{Z}_2)(n \geq 2)$. Then R is nil-clean. But $R/J(R)$ is not Boolean. Here, R is not abelian.

Corollary 2.8 *Let R be commutative, and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean.

(2) $R/J(R)$ is Boolean and $J(R)$ is nil.

(3) For any $a \in R$, $a - a^2 \in R$ is nilpotent.

Proof (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) Let $a \in R$. In view of Theorem 2.7, $a - a^2 \in J(R)$. Since R is commutative, we see that $J(R)$ is nil if and only if $J(M_n(R))$ is nil. Therefore $a - a^2 \in R$ is nilpotent.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) Clearly, $R/J(R)$ is Boolean. For any $a \in J(R)$, we have $(a - a^2)^n = 0$ for some $n \geq 1$. Hence, $a^n(1-a)^n = 0$, and so $a^n = 0$. This implies that $J(R)$ is nil.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) As R is commutative, we see that $M_n(J(R))$ is nil. This completes the proof, by Theorem 2.7. □

Furthermore, we observe that the converse of [2, Corollary 7] is true as the following shows.

Corollary 2.9 *A commutative ring R is nil-clean if and only if $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean.*

Proof One direction is obvious by [2, Corollary 7]. Suppose that $M_n(R)$ is nil-clean. In view of Corollary 2.8 that $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ is nil-clean, and that $J(R)$ is nil. Therefore R is nil-clean, by Lemma 2.1. $\square$

Example 2.10 *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $M_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is nil-clean if and only if $m = 2^r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Write $m = p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s} (p_1, \cdots, p_s$ are distinct primes, $r_1, \cdots, r_s \in \mathbb{N})$. Then $Z_m \cong Z_{p_1^{r_1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus Z_{p_m^{r_s}}$. In light of Corollary 2.8, $M_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is nil-clean if and only if $s = 1$ and $Z_{p_1^{r_1}}$ is nil-clean. Therefore we are done by Lemma 2.5.*

References

[1] A.J. Diesl, Nil clean rings, *J. Algebra*, **383**(2013), 197–211.

[2] S. Breaz; G. Galugareanu; P. Danchev and T. Micu, Nil-clean matrix rings, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, **439**(2013), 3115–3119.

[3] H. Chen, *Rings Related Stable Range Conditions*, Series in Algebra 11, World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ, 2011.

[4] M.T. Kosan; T.K. Lee and Y. Zhou, When is every matrix over a division ring a sum of an idempotent and a nilpotent? *Linear Algebra Appl.*, **450**(2014), 7–12.